CHAPTER ONE
LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLICY:
THE DISCURSIVE LANDSCAPING
OF MODERNITY
ASHRAF ABDELHAY,SINFREE B.MAKONI
AND CRISTINE G. SEVERO

1.Language policy and planning: Terminological and conceptual issues

The concept of language policy is complex,polysemous and socially contested. Generally, any organised effort to affect the existing patterns of language choice, structure and acquisition is a form of language planning (Ricento 2006;Tollefson 2008). Although language-planning practices permeate all spheres of social life, it is readily observable in the field of education where it is mainly concerned with decisions about the selection of the medium of teaching. This role can be appreciated because education is normally viewed as the cornerstone of political and social processes of integration. The result of this process is explicit or implicit language policy for a given institution (e.g. school): a set of norms or guidelines which are intended to direct linguistic behaviour(Tollefson 2008).Haugen (1959) was credited with the use of this term to cover both status and corpus planning in relation to standardisation of the Norwegian language.

Language policy is heterogeneous and varies according to its object, levels of intervention,purpose,participants and institutions involved, underlying language ideologies,local contexts, power relations,and historical context, among others. Language policy and planning is also related to socio-political contexts:North American,European,African, Asian, Latin American and Russian/Soviet traditions, for example, do not share the same theoretical-methodological priorities and approaches. Despite such heterogeneity, the birth of language policy as an institutionalised field occurred parallel to the emergence of socio-linguistics. One institutional landmark of this emergence was a seminar organised by William Bright at the University of California in 1964, which gathered together scholars such as Einar Haugen, William Labov, John Gumperz, Dell Hymes and Charles Ferguson. We understand that the emergence of language policy as a discipline serves as an ideological framework that imposes a “domain of objects, a set of methods, a corpus of propositions considered to be true, a game of rules and definitions, of techniques and instruments” (Foucault 1981:59).

This initial phase of the configuration of language policy in the West as a disciplinary field aimed at systematising and rationalising a model applicable to the description of the relationship between languages and their functions within the limits of the national state followed what we can call ‘a politics of functionalisation'.This period is reflected in a field-shaping body of publications in the 1960s and 1970s, which linked language planning with processes of modernisation and nation-building. One example of the scholars' concern with national issues was the publication of Language Problems of Developing Nations in 1968 by Fishman, Ferguson and Das Gupta. The principle of “methodological nationalism” (Wimmer and Schiller 2002)oriented the practice of language planning toward a particular ideology of language.

Language ideologies refer to commonsensical notions about language structures and functions, which normatively position their users in the social system, and they are enacted through institutional and everyday practices (Tollefson 2008;Rubdy 2008; Haviland 2003). Language ideologies embody conceptions about the functions, values, norms, expectations, preferences, predictions and roles that guide linguistic practice (Blommaert 2006). Language ideologies in turn articulate broader socio-political ideologies.

Any institutionalised choice of a linguistic variety as the official medium of conducting formal politics and education has significant stratificational effects on the groups and individuals whose varieties are systematically excluded and devalued. In this sense, we understand that “status planning decisions conform to ideologies of the power elite or respond to conflicting ideologies between those upheld by the power elite and those of other constituent groups” (Cobarrubias 1983:62). In other words, the formative phase of the field of language planning was informed by a “reflectionist” (Silverstein 1985) view of language, where language is viewed as a corpus of words standing for independently existing things.

However, as later critical theoretical developments showed, all policy discourses on language are performative in the sense that they are creative acts of social representation and thus they are associated with issues of power relations and inequality(Bourdieu 1991). Under the right institutional conditions, when an official policy 'names' ‘a dialect' as ‘a language',a new social construction is brought into being; a new symbolic representation is imposed on the existing reality.

Examples of an initial domain of objects and methods in language policy and planning include standardisation, hierarchical classifications of languages (vernacular, standard, classical, creole and pidgin) and the classification of language functions (teaching language, official, international,lexical modernisation, nationalisation and terminological unification, among others) (Lo Bianco 2004;Calvet 2007;Manley 2008;for a detailed review of the goals, see Hornberger 2006).

Standardisation in the broad sense involves the selection, codification and implementation or imposition of a norm(Haugen 1983;Milroy and Milroy 1999). The discursive mechanisms of codification and institutionalisation impose order on the selected norm and they effect a binary opposition between standard and non-standard, and it is these socially embedded values which guide the linguistic choices of individuals(Blommaert 1999) Hence, these mechanisms are strategies of effecting consensus, power and inequality because they establish systemically ratified linguistic hierarchies. In other words, standardisation enforces constraints to manage the functional distribution of linguistic varieties, and these restrictions result in unequal socio-linguistic repertoires that shape access to social opportunities (Blommaert 1999).It is a deep political process because it creates difference and hegemony through mechanisms of normalisation and naturalisation including the educational apparatus. Language planning and policy as theory and practice were implicated in projects of nation building and the construction of subjectivities. As noted by a number of scholars in the field of nationalism studies(e.g. Anderson 1991), standardisation as a process of linguistic regimentation or institutionalisation

plays a fundamental role in the construction of 'nation states'. Thus, language planning has always been a political enterprise.

The framework of language policy has helped to construct abstracted, detached and codified (standardised) concepts of language that have been reproduced by pedagogical manuals. This view of language is called “standard language ideology”(Lippi-Green 1997). In addition, at the beginning of language policy as a disciplinary field, “in keeping with the prevailing intellectual climate of scientific optimism, only a minority of LPP [language policy and planning] pioneers were sceptical about any limits to technical protocols and many imagined banishing subjectivity and interests from consideration ” (Lo Bianco 2004:740).Such technical aspects have been prioritised to the detriment of political ones, helping to shape a positivist practice that, although the subject of repeated criticism, still models contemporary language policy(Rajagopalan 2005).

The critical linguistic ethnographic perspective to language planning emerged as a critique of the traditional approaches and it is informed by the critical social theory. In this perspective, the notion of 'social context' is made much more sophisticated than in the traditional approach. A context is a dynamic construction in social interaction through a generically situated performance of an ensemble of cultural norms, knowledge, conditions and practices that define and regulate it as a social and cultural space. It is a complex of multi-layered structures of material and symbolic relations which organise language use. Contexts are not exclusively regimented or excessively ordered and objectively embedded as in the case of ritualised discursive orders(e.g.doctor-patient interaction), or as in the case of other institutions of social reproduction(e.g. school),where individuals are positioned according to relatively fixed roles and statuses(e.g. Silverstein's presupposed indexicality).Contexts are also ‘emergent', created and shaped by interactional practices. The implication for language planning here is that research should focus not just on the objective dimensions of context but also on the subjective world of ideologies and representations.

In the mainstream trend, language is viewed as disconnected from its authorising environment (which is a prerequisite for the imposition of standard languages). By contrast, in the critical perspective, ‘language' is viewed as ‘culture':it is always relatively dialectically authorised and locally regulated and valued. It is in this sense that language policy is a metapragmatic discourse in that it links linguistic issues with socio-political issues. Most importantly, the question of the ‘sovereign subject’ which featured in the traditional paradigm is now converted into the question of ‘voice' and agency in the symbolic horizons of power relations. Thus, what is needed to be investigated is the total discursive apparatus including the historical conditions of constitution and interpretation which(de)value linguistic products.

In keeping with language policy, language planning is neither uniform nor homogeneous. For example, Einar Haugen(1966),in Language Conflict and Language Planning:The Case of Modern Norwegian, systematised four levels of language planning: norm selection, coding/standardisation, implementation/acceptance and elaboration/modernisation of language. These levels were later expanded to include corpus planning(coding, graphization, grammar,lexical systematisation, literary manuals),status planning (language designations and

uses, according to laws and decrees), acquisition planning(language teaching and learning policies), planning of uses (politics of dissemination and use of languages) and prestige planning (evaluation of linguistic uses). The first two were proposed by Kloss(1967), the third was added by Cooper(1989),and the fourth and fifth were suggested by Baker(2003). In addition to these five levels, we can include ‘discourse planning',which is charged with dealing with the ideological work of institutions, media, and discourses of authority in the production and circulation of beliefs and language ideologies (Lo Bianco 2004).

We argue that the proposal of macro, meso and micro levels of intervention in language policy follows what can be called a “politics of scale” (Summerson and Lempert 2016). From this scaling perspective, as applied to language policy, there are two explicit political dimensions at play: one that links language policy to institutional, vertical, official and legal actions, and another that focuses language policy on local beliefs and practices, ideologies, and motivations that lead the subjects to choose one or another language option. Spolsky (2004), for example, proposes an approximation between local policies and practices, with a focus on language management, language ideologies and language practices. In this case, the boundaries between language policy and planning become more tenuous. Such a local perspective has helped to deconstruct the prioritisation of top-down and macro politics: “Whereas the language planning literature has focused mainly on the macro level, it is important to understand that language policy and planning operates at the micro level as well” (Kaplan and Baldauf 1997:1).

Such a politics of scale also has helped to shape what counts as language in Africa, Latin America and the Arab world. In addition, educational policies in such contexts are shaped by this stratified conception of language and the regime of language rights that it presupposes. In this sense, language policy and planning are ideological political frameworks embedded in both broad and local contexts. According to Bonacina-Pugh (2012: 216), “Language policy and planning are ideological processes which contribute to maintaining unequal power relationships between majority and minority language groups.” We consider that, by assuming pre-organised models and methods applicable to local language contexts, we tend to reproduce universal practices and ideologies that have historically favoured some individuals or groups (the so-called West- and North-oriented language policy) to the detriment of others (the so-called East- and South-oriented perspectives). We also understand that an analysis of the regime of language rights must consider contemporary capitalism and technology, for which the ideas of diversity and local culture have been turned into objects of desire and consumption. Dor (2004:102) notes, “Linguistic and cultural relativism is a popular commodity within the business community. Researching linguistic and cultural variability, and selling the results of this research, is a flourishing business.”

Johnson and Ricento (2013), in a revision of the literature on the field of language policy and planning, propose the following chronology:(a)early language planning scholarship that began in the 1960s and was focused on the politics of unification, for which language was seen as a resource and subject to technical planning;(b) expanded works in the 1970s and 1980s that started to criticise the positivist perspective of early works;(c) critical language policy that considers the political mechanisms that underlie language policy and planning; and (d) the

emergence of the ethnography of language policy in the 21st century,which combines structure-agency, micro-macro and policy-practice perspectives. Although such a revision seems didactic and only coherent mainly in North American and European contexts, we believe that it does not problematise colonial and post-colonial language policy and planning. Hornberger(2006)integrated the various language-planning goals, types and approaches in one conceptual framework (see Figure 1.1).

We believe that a critical and historical perspective is needed to understand both (a) the effects of Euro-North American perspectives on how languages have been shaped in non-European or non-North American contexts and (b) local non-Euro-North American concepts and ‘experiences of language'. This means that even ethnography, as it has been shaped into North American and European academic contexts, may help to reproduce historical colonial ideologies. We argue that history helps us to comprehend how colonial memories have been reproduced and updated into contemporary language policy and planning.

Finally, we may consider that language policy is strongly related to specific identity politics, which means that discourses on language also concern specific ways of framing the other. For example, the linguistic question concerning immigrants or refugees is also a question of identity related to what counts as being a citizen in national or nationalised contexts. In these contexts, linguistic choice and linguistic use are an “authorized” human right (Whiteley 2003). Discourses of endangerment strategically framed languages as natural species (e.g. ‘language death'), and hence they provided a basis for the mainstream discourse of language rights. The organicist ideologies of language are schemes of place-making and making of a specific form of subjectivity (for example, Errington's rhetoric of language endangerment). A critical semiotic ethnographic lens argues for a consideration of language rights within a conceptualisation of linguistic relativity by focusing on the ways that local socio-linguistic markets organise linguistic resources (Bourdieu 1991).

The ideas of assimilation and integration, as well as of dialect, variety and language, also can be problematised from a political, historical, discursive, multi-translingual and multi-semiotic language perspective.

Types	*Policy planning approach* (on form)	*Cultivation planning approach* (on function)
Status planning (about uses of language)	**Officialization** **Nationalization** **Standardization of status** **Proscription**	**Revival** **Maintenance** **Spread** **Interlingual communication – international, intranational**
Acquisition planning (about users of language)	**Group** **Education/School** **Literary** **Religious** **Mass media** **Work**	**Reacquisition** **Maintenance** **Shift** **Foreign language/second language/literacy**
	Selection Language's formal role in society *Extra-linguistic aims*	**Implementation** Language's functional role in society *Extra-linguistic aims*
Corpus planning (about language)	**Standardization of corpus** **Standardization of auxiliary code** **Graphization**	**Modernization** (new functions) **Lexical** **Stylistic** **Renovation** (new forms, old functions) **Purification** **Reform** **Stylistic simplification** **Terminology unification**
	Codification Language's form *Linguistic aims*	**Elaboration** Language's functions *Semi-linguistic aims*

Figure 1.1: Language policy and planning goals: an integrative framework (Hornberger 2006:29)

Another phenomenon, which is addressed by language planning, is the semiotic articulation of social spaces. The notion of 'linguistic landscape' was born within the field of language planning, particularly in the contexts of Belgium and Quebec to stress the role of language in organising the public space through the regulation of language usage on public signs (Landry and Bourhis 1997). However, the concept of linguistic landscape was under-theorised and under-researched in the traditional practice of language planning, which focused mainly on issues related to corpus and status planning. Landy and Bourhis (1997:25) provided the following formulation of the concept that became the default definition:

The language of public road signs, advertising billboards, street names, place names, commercial shop signs, and public signs on government buildings combines to form the linguistic landscape of a given territory, region, or urban agglomeration.

Although the seminal study of Landry and Bourhis(1997)adopted a statistical approach in the study of the linguistic landscape as a variable of ethnolinguistic vitality in multilingual contexts, the field has now developed immensely in terms of methodology and epistemology using different interdisciplinary perspectives and methods including semiotics, ethnography and discourse analysis (Blommaert 2013;Shohamy and Gorter 2009). Research in the field now engages with cultural and social theory to explore the ways historical and social forces are materialised and sedimented in the linguistic landscape. This ethnographic historical emphasis problematised the abstract and self-contained notion of ‘language' and instead broadened it to include all modes of semiotic communication and how they are linked with other social, political and economic factors (see Mokwena, Chapter Eight).

2. Colonial discourses of language: A Eurocentric monoglossia

Colonial discourses of language and practices in non-Western contexts, including Africa, the Arab Middle East and Latin America, have actively contributed to the construction of specific socio-communicative realities. Colonial language policies are part and parcel of colonial strategies of governmentality that include, among other things, the social invention of artificial structures of belonging and the imputation of hierarchically stratified values to ‘local idioms' in relation to one another, on the one hand, and in relation to Western media of communication, on the other. The material effect of this social ideological restructuring of the existing pre-colonial relations is a plethora of spatially bounded, racially managed and romantically aestheticised ethnic bodies and categories. Although the colonial discourses of language are not strictly uniform or monolithic (e.g. the French versus the British pattern), they have generally shaped, among other things, the post-colonial sectarianisation of formal politics and the politicisation of sectarian relations. The current socio-political conditions in almost all African countries and the Arab world (e.g. Lebanon,Iraq) are cases in point. These conditions are one of the key reasons for situating the current socio-economic and discursive relations in these countries in wider historical contexts: to understand how (trans-)local relations have become the way they are.

These colonial and post-colonial linguistic projects that are linked with processes of nation-building are informed by a particular instrumental conception of language as a 'means of communication' or the instrumental view of language that conceives of it as neutral (thus apolitical), singular (thus unvarying), fixed (thus unaffected by contextual usage) and strictly rule-governed(rather than partly chaotic). Such a language is conceived of as predating the social interaction as a totality that includes speakers and, thus, is treated as naturally given rather than interactionally emergent. We argue that colonial ideologies that helped to shape, classify and label languages still reverberate in contemporary language practice and planning in regard to certain local practices as their being non-languages or small, defective or degenerated languages.

It is remarkable that language ideological conflicts in contexts such as Algeria always interrogate the institutionalised status of ex-colonial languages, such as French (e.g. see Benrabah, Chapter Two). Even though some countries (e.g.Sudan) have abandoned formalised colonial language policies, they still live with discursive coloniality as a condition. It is precisely the objective of the colonial linguistic perspective to trace this everyday lived condition of coloniality in the Global South. In what follows, we identify the main properties of this colonial narrative of language.

First, the colonial narrative of language aestheticised social relations through the naturalisation of historical categories of interaction, such as 'indigenous languages'. The construct that implies pre-modern ‘purity' is designed to serve specific theological and pragmatic ends. For example, in some African contexts, the conception of linguistic indigeneity was one of the discursive resources for the artificial creation of 'tribal' relations as they are ‘imagined’, particularly by the colonial Christian missionaries. Indigenous languages are thus institutionally ‘enregistered' (Agha 2007) with specific spatialised groups. This semiotic process of enregisteration effected a particular conceptualisation of the ‘local', which was 'normalised' through the production of text artefacts, such as dictionaries, primers and textbooks.

Although the text artefacts are projected as objective instruments of education, this process of knowledge construction rationalised the unequal power relations between the ‘locals' and the missionary organisations. If 'indigenous languages' in some contexts are a product of language-planning intervention, this means that the notions of ‘mother tongue' and ‘native speakers' upon which these ‘indigenous languages' are patterned are themselves part of this 'colonial order of things' (see Makoni, Severo and Abdelhay, Chapter Nine). In other words, what counts as a 'mother tongue’ or who counts as a 'native speaker' in these ‘indigenous languages' can now be determined ‘objectively' with reference to a set of codified textual standards. In the colonial narrative of language, the term ‘indigenous languages' is cued with specific ideological articulation to represent the ‘exotic' and 'pure' Other (i.e. the pre-modern). The current use of the term 'indigenous language', particularly in international legal discourse and by indigenous people themselves, has ‘erased' this negative ideological trajectory and injected the term with a positive loading, such as through the use of the term ‘plurality' (Maurial 1999). We argue, however, that in historically dynamic contexts structured by relations of conflict over political and material resources (e.g. Sudan), the term can be strategically employed in official policy documents to index the 'Other' (e.g. Arab(ised)). The point here is that

colonial language planning activities are essentially 'performative': they result in the construction and naturalisation of hierarchically controlled ethnolinguistic differences 'locally' anchored to specific ‘places'.

One of the significant discursive strategies of organising social diversity used by colonial governments, including missionaries and professional linguists, is ‘conferences'. During colonial conferences, such as the Rejaf Language Conference in Sudan in 1928, ethnolinguistic boundaries are constructed, codified, imposed and naturalised. This is precisely the colonial brand of multiculturalism/multilingualism that largely determined the post-colonial nature of political practice in the Global South.

Another characteristic of the colonial discourses of language is that they embody monoglossic ideologies that conceptualise 'monolingualism' as the normative yardstick against which dynamic linguistic practices are assessed. Eurocentric monoglossia treats ‘language' as a monolithic whole that is statistically countable, stable and abstract. As a conceptual apparatus, monoglossia is a mechanism of regulating and organising access to formal institutions of knowledge production.

In short, concepts are organised within structural frameworks and theories. The Western theories of language have provided us with concepts cued with specific theoretical and ideological loads. The list of such loaded terms includes ‘language', ‘mother tongue', ‘native speaker', ‘language rights', ' first language' and ‘bilingualism'. And most of the contributions in this volume used or critiqued these terms as they are used in the Western conceptualisations of language and society.

3. Arabic and the emblematic function of language

The socio-linguistic situation in the Arab world is complex, as public policies and political ideologies are interwoven with the issues of language policies. The relatively established national socio-communicative orders that comprise the Arab world are generally conceptualised as 'diglossic’ (in Ferguson's (1959,1991) sense of the term). That is, Arabic register variation is functionally, thus hierarchically, organised into a high variety (normally represented by Standard Arabic or Fus-ha) and a low variety (represented by the dialects or the Colloquial). Diglossic language situations articulate the power and status positions of the linguistic groups within the social stratification (Bourhis, Montaruli and Amiot 2007).

It is not our aim to review the notion of diglossia in relation to Arabic, as there is voluminous literature on the topic. Rather, it is our aim to stress that language policy and planning in the Arab world should always be inspected as an aspect of a wider monoglot (Silverstein 1996) socio-political totality. To do this, we can use the macro-level concept of diglossia as aheuristic entry into the political and cultural history of the region. Indeed, diglossic language situations provide one image of how discursive relations are organised in the Arab world; however, it is the most prominent image because it is embedded in folk ideologies of languages (Suleiman 2014).

Language use should be understood as a totality with two broad dimensions: the instrumental and symbolic (Suleiman 2003). Any single instance of language use involves this dual function though one dominates over the other. In some contexts, the instrumental dimension might be strategically reified to perform specific emblematic functions (Silverstein2003; Suleiman 2013, 2014). It is the emblematic or symbolic dimension of diglossia which is under-emphasised in the literature as it relates to the issue of conflict, history and identity. Language planning and policy has to take this distinction into account very seriously to explore policies and articulate ideologies (Bassiouney 2009). The three contributions in this volume more or less operate with this distinction in the background.

In the Arab world, formal politics is organised in terms of cultural constructions, such as the Umma, which is predominantly identified as ‘apan-national identity', although in some modern contexts it is loosely used as an equivalent to the Western concept of 'nation'. The word watan is equivalent to the ‘State' (as understood in the Western conceptual system) (Bassiouney 2009). Historically, the Arab and Islamic world had its own distinctive form of modernity before its systematic incorporation into the world order of territorially bounded nation states. This is where the significance of language policy has emerged as a cultural instrument of a(pan)nation-building process. A significant caveat should be noted before proceeding. Language planning as an institutionalised process of cultural selection, exclusion and codification was exercised by the companion of Prophet Mohamed, Abu Bakr (573-634) (Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/biography/Abu-Bakr (accessed 26 February 2019).), as a textual mechanism of compiling the Qur'an into one recognised standard copy.

Equally important, due to Islamic expansion into largely non-Arabic speaking territories and communities, the early Muslim scholars, supported by governing politicians, subjected a particular variety of Arabic to a process of standardisation with the goal to protect 'the language of the Quran' from 'corruption' as an effect of being used by the Ajam (individuals for whom Arabic is not their mother tongue). The point here is that the Muslim world already had an idea of the grammatical construction of languages before the start of Western colonialism. Thus, the question here, which will link diglossia with politics, should address the socio-linguistic effects of Western modernity on the linguistic culture in this region.

Briefly, the modern structure of the state in the Arab world is shaped, either directly or indirectly, by, among other things, the cultural discourses of Western colonialism (see Benrabah, Chapter Two). Following independence, most of the Arab countries involved in a modernisation process of nation-building use the Western model as a reference. Legislating Arabicisation language policies and setting up language-planning apparatuses, such as Arabic language academies and a modern education system, were part of this process of nation-building. In this nationalist scheme, Arabic (read: Standard Arabic) was given a place of pride as both a bureaucratic instrument of communication and as a symbol of belonging to a particular nation (Suleiman 2003). The underlying dominant ideology of language was a centripetal monoglot conception of ‘one language, one nation'. All centrifugal voices and forces were brutally suppressed or subordinated.This is the case in the majority of the Arab countries.

Another feature of the ideological language policies in the Arab world is that ‘language' is treated as singular (e.g. ‘the Arabic language' is the official language of Egypt). This, in part, is an effect of systematic reduction of variability not just within ‘Arabic' but, most importantly, within ‘Standard Arabic'. This centripetal conception of Arabicisation is also reflected in ‘language ideological debates’ (Blommaert 1999), for which ‘Arabic’ (understood as Standard Arabic) is rhetorically projected as an ‘endangered language'.

Arabic discourses of language endangerment are, by default, ‘purist' in orientation. Arabic should be constantly purified from the structural effects of using colloquial and foreign languages. This form of socially established language anxiety rationalises and reinforces a linguistic hierarchy between the colloquial and the standard, on the one hand, and between Arabic and European languages, on the other. Institutional mechanisms of Arabic language planning, such as codification, including the production of dictionaries (whether general, specialised or historical), have imposed constraints that organise the usage of Arabic registers in specific socio-linguistic orders. This results in the emergence of unevenly distributed verbal repertoires, and thus unequal relations of power, in the standard or highly valued registers of Arabic.

It is worth remarking that there is no necessary correlation between a given standard language and ‘prestige': an urbanised Arabic dialect, such as the Cairene Arabic, is viewed by some speakers as prestigious and highly valued even though it is generally a non-standard variety of Arabic (Haeri2003). However, the standard register remains the preferred choice at the ideological level, as compared with the Arabic dialect, due mainly to its relationship with the Qur'an (see Almahmoud and Ahmed, Chapter Four). The Arabic monoglot ideology operates through concrete multilingual practices by shaping the speakers' attitudes toward their own linguistic resources in relation to Arabic (see Alkooheji, Chapter Five).

In short, Arabic diglossia is about the social organisation of Arabic register variation, and it is intimately linked with political ideologies and, thus, with questions of power hierarchy and inequality. Nationalist projects of belonging exploit a monoglot ideology of Arabic ('one language, one nation') as a basis of achieving and justifying these objectives. The situated strategies of conducting formal politics by the proxy of Arabicisation led to the emergence of anti-hegemonic ideologies of language that, particularly when successful, are cemented in official (multilingual) language policies, as in the case of Morocco and Sudan (see Benton-Monahan and Severo, Chapter Three; Makoni et al., Chapter Nine).

4. The structure of the book

In this book, we understand a language as a socially configured, dynamic and thus variant, and situated complex of resources (e.g.registers of various types, styles, dialects, genres). In other words, language is a historical and political phenomenon, as it is articulated and articulating the real socio-political concerns of people in a context invested with power relations and social struggle. This means that the trajectory of any language is, by definition, an ideological one and an aspect of the wider social dynamics and processes that constitute the conditions of existence. To understand the intricate relationship between language and socio-economic phenomena (e.g.

racism, effects of colonialism), a comprehensive investigation of language usage should re-insert linguistic products (e.g.a policy statement) into an ethnographically and historically reconstructed complexity of practices and processes. This is precisely what each contribution tries to do in its own way. The following nine chapters that comprise this book are described below.

This volume offers unique cross-cultural perspectives on language planning and policy in diverse African and Middle Eastern contexts, including South Africa, Bahrain, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Zambia and Algeria. The South American diaspora is also considered, as in the case of Brazil. By bringing together diverse contexts in Africa and the Middle East, this volume encourages a dialogue in the burgeoning scholarship in language policies in the different regions of these areas. In this volume, the main objective is to analyse the social, political and educational functions of official language policies and their impact on religious, national and sectarian identities. The second objective of the book is to provide ananalys is of both common and professional views of multilingualism and how they shape, and are shaped by, language policies.

The third objective of the volume is to analyse language policy texts from diverse theoretical perspectives, using linguistic landscapes, colonial linguistics, colonial history, language ideology, language attitude and systemic functional linguistics. Such a diverse framework helps to shape an interdisciplinary perspective toward language. The fourth objective is to highlight several examples of language use, language ideologies and language policy in African and Middle Eastern contexts, signalling the role played by colonial ideologies in contemporary views. The volume concludes by exploring the contributions that scholarship from the Global South in colonial and post-colonial contexts can make to language scholarship generally.

Mohamed Benrabah's chapter, Undoing the “Old World”: The Politics of Language in Colonial and Post-Colonial Algeria, addresses from a critical perspective the linguistic-cultural excesses of colonisation and decolonisation in Algeria. Benrabah argues that colonial practices introduced by Europeans have tended to continue in former colonies and that linguistic decolonisation remains incomplete due to the resilience of colonial language ideologies. The author discusses both (i) the colonial implementation of a practice of Frenchification to de-Arabise and de-Berberize the colonised people and (ii) the post-independence implementation by local leaders of a practice of de-Frenchification, whereby debates on national identity had to deal with Islam and the Arabic language. Both political practices are, according to Benrabah, imbued with colonial ideologies, such as the ideology of ethnicization, the monolingual ideology and the ideology of language hierarchies. For the author, the project of decolonisation failed to offer linguistic peace to Algerians, as linguistic divisions continue to reproduce colonial ideologies.

Chelsea Benton-Monahan and Cristine Gorski Severo, in Amazigh Language Policy in Morocco and the Power of Contradiction, describe the Amazigh language policy based on the relation between scholarly research and a local individual's experience. The Amazigh language has been battling for higher status and officiality against Arabic and French for almost seven decades in Morocco. Its speakers comprise the so-called indigenous population of Morocco as well as its close neighbours of Algeria, Tunisia, Libya and Mauritania, holding deep, cultural ties to the land. The

authors show how the Amazigh language gained recognition, first being taught in schools in 2000 and then being made into an official language in 2011, which stands in contrast to the perspective of an Amazigh teacher in Morocco, whose personal experience reveals how language policy is a product of the tension between top-down and bottom-up forces.

Mahmoud A. Almahmoud and Mahgoub Dafalla Ahmed are the authors of the chapter titled Language Planning in the Saudi Context through Investigating Students' Attitudes Towards SA, CA and English. They investigate Saudi university students' attitudes towards using two Arabic language varieties, Standard Arabic (SA) and Colloquial Arabic (CA), in addition to English. The demographic situation in Saudi Arabia, characterised by its high numbers of non-Arab foreigners, has contributed to the creation of a unique socio-linguistic reality. For example, an individual may use SA to write an official letter, CA to speak with friends, pidgin to talk to foreign workers and English to order in a restaurant. The results show that students almost always use CA but rarely use SA or English, and that SA is more widely applied in the media than in social interactions or education. In addition, all students have a stronger progressive attitude towards using English as compared to the two Arabic language varieties. The positive attitudes towards SA may indicate that students are influenced by religious, linguistic and cultural factors.

The chapter titled Identity Perception of Pakistani and Balochi Minorities at State Schools in Bahrain in Association With (Implicit) Language Policy, by Lamya Alkooheji, is based on observations of Urdu and Balochiim migrant students in Bahraini state schools and explores how the students themselves perceive their native language(s) and the Arabic language after being exposed to the language policies practised in their schools. Bahrain is a small country in the Arabian Gulf in the Middle East with a dense population of over a million people in an area of 770 km2. The official language in this country is Arabic. The chapter explores how implicit language policies affect participants' linguistic choices and their attitude towards each language. The Bahraini government permits all residents to benefit from its state schools for free. This has created multilingual communities within state schools, where the main medium of instruction is Arabic. The findings confirm the positive impact of the implicit educational language policy without suppressing language rights or creating discomfort for those with an ethnic background.

Felix Banda and David Sani Mwanza's chapter, “The idea was that those who were trained needed to teach others": Critical Reflections on the 2014 Zambian Language of Initial Literacy Policy Change, focuses on a specific change of language in education policy that occurred in Zambia in 2014. This proposed that the language of instruction from nursery school to grade 4 would be one of the seven official zoned Zambian languages. The authors use observation and interview data from teacher training college lecturers, primary and secondary school teachers of Zambian languages, and Zambian languages subject experts to evaluate the policy shift. Banda and Mwanza also trace the history of contradictions and contestations that surround language education policies in Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia) through missionaries, the British South Africa Company, the British Colonial Office and the emergent independent African government administrations. Their findings show that the new policy is not different from those that had failed in the past for their rigidity in application and for insisting on standard versions of Zambian languages when few teachers and learners spoke them.

In the chapter titled A Systemic Functional Grammar Analysis of Clause 29 in the Bill of Rights of South Africa's Constitution Act 108 of 1996 with Reference to the Post-Apartheid Maintenance of a System of Racialised Identities: Implications for Nation-Building, Ebrahim Alexander and Leon Pretorius argue that the maintenance of a post-apartheid racial classification system is at odds with meaningful transformation for all South Africancitizens. The authors advocate that public policy appraisal should include, in addition to the implementation of language policy and management considerations, the textual dimension, which includes the level that people interpret and come to understand public policy as discourse. In their conclusion, the authors highlight South Africa's post-apartheid maintenance of a system of racialised identities, as implicated in its ‘diversity' concepts in the preambles of the selected public policy documents.

Lorato Mokwena's chapter, “As long as I understand the customers, I will answer them": The Translingual Tuckshop vs the Pluralised Monolingual South African Constitution, deals with the contrast between a tuckshop owner's fluid approach to language and the South African Constitution's approach to language. While the South African government inherited and institutionalised a colonial epistemological perspective of language, Mokwena illustrates how the tuckshop exists as a translanguaging space by using linguistic landscape material and interview data with tuckshop owners and customers. The chapter argues that, although the Constitution portrays South Africa as a plural monolingual society, in reality and on a broader scale, South African society consists of various translanguaging spaces such as the linguistic/semiotic landscape of tuckshops.

Sinfree Makoni, Cristine Severo and Ashraf Abdelhay, the authors of Colonial Linguistics and the Invention of Language, aim to contribute to the large debate about how language policy and practice have been historically shaped by local context through focusing on the role played by colonial linguistics in Sudan and Brazil. The authors assume colonial linguistics as a contemporary approach that has revisited colonial narratives on the political role played by language in colonising processes, which includes the idea that language policy has traditionally been faced with the relationship between colonisation and language. The authors problematise the broad generic use of categories such as 'colonial policy', 'colonial expansion', ‘post-colonial indigenous language', ‘colonial language’, ‘colonial area', 'colonial power' and 'colonial world', among others, to cover local contexts.

In Post-Colonial Language Education or Coloniality of Language by Stealth? Finex Ndhlovu seeks to add new theorisation to conversations on post-colonial African language policies by bringing to light the intricate linkages between language policy making, the interests of politics, and the exigencies of fashioning linguistic and cultural uniformity in the midst of diversity. The author's argument is that although language policies are generally designed with good intentions, they also have a darker side. They often result in unintended consequences, such as the social, economic and political exclusion or marginalisation of speakers of minority ethnic and reticent languages. The author proposes that mainstream models of language education - multilingual education, mother tongue education, additive bilingual education-that are widely celebrated in post-apartheid South Africa exemplify the subtle manifestation of the ‘coloniality of language',

which problematises the relationship between language and power by raising the question: Are there no philosophies of or about language other than those inherited from the Global North? If they are indeed absent, why are we not able to develop some? Why do scholars, governments and social policy experts from the Global South always choose the easy route of adopting the language ideologies and theoretical frameworks that originate from the Global North?